

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,648	01/30/2002	Robert O. Williams III	61113A	2157
109	7590 02/03/2004		EXAMINER	
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY			DOERRLER, WILLIAM CHARLES	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION P. O. BOX 1967		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MIDLAND,	MIDLAND, MI 48641-1967		3744	1/
			DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004	4 //

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(a)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/062,648	WILLIAMS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William C Doerrler	3744				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address \ \				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nety filed s will be considered timety. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.					
closed in accordance with the practice under b	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-22 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some colon None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '285 PCT document from the 1-9-2003 IDS in view of Buxton et al.

The '285 PCT document discloses applicants' basic inventive concept, the rapid freezing of effective ingredients including pharmaceuticals in liquid argon or nitrogen (see page 5 lines 21-24), substantially as claimed with the exception of specifying that an insulated nozzle is positioned below the liquid surface (figure 2 appears to show this feature, but it is not well described). Buxton et al discloses a system and method for

Application/Control Number: 10/062,648

Art Unit: 3744

freezing pharmaceuticals which atomizes a flow of the pharmaceutical below the liquid level of a cryogen. Buxton does not specifically show an insulated nozzle. However, Buxton does show a nozzle which is heated to prevent the solution from freezing in the nozzle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention from the teaching of Buxton et al to modify the pharmaceutical freezer of the '285 PCT document by placing the nozzle below the surface of the cryogen to decrease the time required for freezing to ensure high quality, low diameter particles. It is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the heater of Buxton could be replaced by an insulated nozzle (depending on the solution being frozen and the cryogen used) while still maintaining the desired effect. In regard to claim 6, all the solvents listed are well known and thus are considered obvious matters of intended use, which could be frozen in the system of Buxton et al without involving any change of structure or inventive step. In regard to claim 7, see column 2 lines 59-66. In regard to claim 9, see line 17 of column 5 of Buxton which states that the nozzle is within applicants' claimed range. In regard to claim 15, Buxton discloses that the particles may need to be dried. Official Notice is taken that fluid bed driers are well known in the art and as such would have been an obvious modification for an ordinary practitioner in the art to provide sufficiently small, dry particles. In regard to claims 18-22, the physical properties of the particles are seen as being matters of design choice which are effected by the substance used to produce the particles. Since applicant has not claimed to produce a new substance, and the structure used to produce the

Page 3

Art Unit: 3744

particles is the same, one of ordinary skill in the art could easily have produced particles within the range claimed using the device described above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9-16 and 18-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The '285 PCT reference provides the use of liquid argon or nitrogen to rapidly freeze pharmaceuticals.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C Doerrler whose telephone number is (703) 308-0696. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/062,648

Art Unit: 3744

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on (703) 308-2597. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William C Doerrler Primary Examiner Art Unit 3744

WCD